



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

be the Sabbath Psalms in the Temple during those very months in which the constant processions of pilgrims were bringing the first-fruits." Again, there is a tradition (T. B. *Megilla*, 31 b) that the Pentateuchal "curses" were read in connexion with the Decalogue (at Pentecost and Rosh Hashana). The two Psalms of Imprecation (lxi and cix, see Acts i. 20) come the one immediately after 29th Ab, the other immediately after Pentecost. Again, the similarity between the closing Psalms of Book I and the closing Psalms of Book II, which are penitential in character, is explained by Dr. King on his theory, for these Psalms come at Penitential periods in the cycle: Pss. xxii and lxi-lxxii in Elul just before the New Year, and so forth. Here one feels that Dr. King is on doubtful ground, for surely the first book of Psalms was arranged on the principle of grouping together the oldest Psalms. The cycle can hardly have affected this grouping.

Without following Dr. King into his further suggestion of a Psalm-cycle beginning, not as the triennial cycle did in Nisan, but on the second Sabbath in Shebat, enough has been said to indicate the importance and plausibility of his theory. That there was "something in it" was clear enough from Prof. Büchler's investigations. Dr. King has greatly strengthened the case. Students of the Bible owe him their thanks for having placed before them a new principle of criticism which has had fruitful results in Dr. King's hands and may have further results in store.

I. ABRAHAMS.

F. R. TENNANT ON THE FALL AND ORIGINAL SIN.

The Sources of the Doctrines of the Fall and Original Sin, by F. R. TENNANT, M.A., B.Sc. (Cambridge: at the University Press. 1903.)

IN this well-written and learned treatise, Mr. Tennant enunciates sound conclusions with regard to the Jewish attitude on the problems of the Fall and of Original Sin. He is to be specially congratulated on his emancipation from Weber, and Rabbinic studies must gain enormously from the fact that Christian theologians of the rank of Dr. Porter of Yale, and Mr. Tennant of Cambridge, are determined to work independently of such unsafe guides as have previously been accepted as infallible. Mr. Tennant's book is thus doubly welcome. It is intrinsically very good, and extrinsically it is epoch-making in that it marks another stage in the adoption of a truly critical and

objective method in dealing with Jewish theology. Weber, Schürer, and the rest of the Germans, Dalman excepted, apply *à priori* principles to Jewish theology, and such principles are not only misleading as to the interpretation of facts, but they prevent the accurate collection of facts. Such a method finds what it looks for, instead of looking into what it finds. Mr. Tennant proceeds on quite other lines. Hence his book is distinguished by originality of procedure as well as by sobriety of judgment.

The book of course includes much more than the merely Jewish views on the question at issue. The Fall story of Genesis and its exegesis is the starting-point, but the goal is Augustine, reached through the Rabbinical, the apocalyptic, the Pauline, and the early Patristic literature. Mr. Tennant's justification for continuing so far down his inquiry into the *sources* must be cited, as the passage also indicates the general trend of his argument. He had just urged (p. 272) that "the doctrines of the Fall and of Original Sin have their beginnings, as doctrines, neither in the Old Testament nor in the New, but rather in the Jewish speculation and the uncanonical literature of the age which intervened between them." The *form* of that part of the Pauline doctrine which deals with the consequences of Adam's sin "belongs to the elements which the apostle derived from the common intellectual surroundings of his time, and not to the essential contents of the Christian revelation." Mr. Tennant continues (ch. XII):—

The concluding words of the last chapter might seem fitly to close an inquiry as to the *sources* of the doctrines of the Fall and Original Sin, especially if the word "*sources*" be taken very literally. But this work assumes that the doctrines with whose earlier history it is concerned did not receive definite shape and fulness of content until, during the Pelagian controversy in which they were largely involved, they were systematized by the comprehensive mind of S. Augustine. They underwent, of course, much modification and development in subsequent ages; but with such later growth the present treatise has no concern. The point is that the Christian doctrine of the Fall and of its consequences certainly did not exist in anything like completeness in the mind of S. Paul, whereas it had practically assumed its completeness in that of S. Augustine. For this reason, therefore, it will be necessary to examine in some detail the teaching of the earliest writers within the Church on the subject of human sinfulness, until the elements contributed to the later doctrine by Irenaeus, Origen, and Tertullian have been respectively estimated and accounted for. So far we shall still, in some sense, be concerned with *sources*. For it will be seen that the fairly definite results of Jewish exegesis and speculation on the Fall, and the theories elaborated by several pseud-epigraphic writers, however

much of Augustinian thought they anticipated, were not taken over by the earliest ecclesiastical writers, save in so far as these results were indefinitely summarized in S. Paul's brief statements about the connexion between man's sinfulness and Adam's sin. The Church rather began the work of elaborating a theory of the origin and propagation of human sin *de novo*.

The same might be said, with modifications, of the development of doctrine within Judaism. On the one hand the view became more and more prevalent that man is completely responsible for his own sin, though his natural sinful inclinations are appealed to as a ground for the divine mercy. On the other hand the mediaeval Cabbala departed from the earlier Rabbinical conception, and, as is inherent in a mystical theory, attached importance to those very ideas which from another point of view produced the Christian theory of original sin. Mr. Tennant, however, is not concerned with these later developments of Jewish theology. Nor was he writing a full treatise on Sin. His object was solely to discuss the Paradise-story in its relation to the theory of inherited or original sin. Had his intentions been other than they actually were, it would have been necessary to take account of the sin of the Golden Calf, which had much influence on this side of Jewish theology. Thus the Talmud has it, that in every subsequent penalty which the world endured, there was a small ingredient of the Golden Calf (T. B. Sanhedrin, 102a). Even more important is the view that *death* was the penalty, not of Adam's sin, but of the sin of the Golden Calf; cf. Exodus Rabba, XXXII. In that passage the Law freed men from death, but the decree of death was renewed by the sin of the Golden Calf: כִּי־נִשְׁמְרוּ אֱלֹהִים יִשְׂרָאֵל בִּא מוֹת עֲלֵיהֶן. "When they said: These are thy gods, O Israel, death came upon them." And there were other sins which were held to affect posterity. Naturally the acceptance by Israel of the Law on Mount Sinai undid Adam's offence, and it was necessary to seek for some offence later than the revelation to account for Israel's subsequent backslidings and sufferings. All this points to the desire felt to attach to each generation personal responsibility. But on his immediate subject, the Paradise-story and its consequences, Mr. Tennant, as has been indicated above, writes with clear insight into the facts of Rabbinic theology. Of the Paradise-story in Genesis he says (p. 89): "It has been made evident by the general tendency, as well as by certain details of the preceding chapters on the Paradise-story, that any such doctrines as that of a fall of the race in Adam, and that of a corruption of human nature and of hereditary transmission of its sinful bias are not contained in it." Mr. Tennant's view of Rabbinical is as acceptable as his view of the early Biblical position. He rightly

points out that the Rabbis maintained that man had theoretically *control* of his evil impulses, even though these were in actual life very persistent and powerful. Man *can* be sinless, but he *is* almost invariably sinful. This doctrine has found its way into the Jewish liturgy, and it was in the sense that sin is a defect of human nature voluntarily yielded to, rather than an inherited taint, that Psalm li. 7 was often interpreted. Each man's sin was ultimately of his own causing; though of the almost irresistible power and almost universal prevalence of sin the fullest account was taken, if inconsistently so, in the Rabbinical theology.

It must be concluded, then, that the only consequences of the Fall, for the human race, which were asserted in Rabbinic teaching, are death and loss of the various supernatural adornments of Adam's life at the beginning. No diminished freedom of will, no permanent ascendancy of the *yezer hara* established for all generations, were ascribed to the first transgression. Nor do we find any reference to the idea of all the race being in Adam, or identified with Adam, when he sinned. Judaism possessed, indeed, the legend of the pollution of Eve by Satan, and of the taint transmitted by her to her posterity. But this belief, though widespread, does not appear to have served the purpose of an explanation of universal sinfulness. Whether the defilement was understood to be of a moral kind is not made plain; but this fanciful story witnesses to the existence, in Rabbinic circles, of a series of ideas which bear some sort of similarity to those which constitute the doctrine of original sin and hereditary infection of nature (p. 176).

This is a very fair statement of the facts. On the other hand we find that Eve's *punishment* was not necessarily inherited. See e.g. Exodus Rabba, I: מיכן לנשים צדקניות שלא היו בפיתקה של חוה. Also there are distinct passages in which it is denied that men die now because of Adam's sin. Thus in Pesikta de R. Kahana (ed. Buber, p. 76a); Tanchuma אמור (ed. Buber, p. 90): רבי יהודה אומר אם יאמר: לך אדם שאילו לא חטא אדם הראשון ואכל מאותו העץ היה חי וקיים לעולם אמור לו אתה וכבר היה אליהו שלא חטא הוא חי וקיים לעולם: Sometimes, too, the tables were turned. Instead of Adam's sin inflicting death on his descendants, it is occasionally held that the sin of Adam's descendants inflicted death on him. See e.g. Bereshith Rabba, § 9: ראויה היה אדם הראשון שלא יטעום טעם מות' ולמה נקנסה בו: מיתה' אלא צפה הקב"ה שנבוכדנצר וחירם עתידין לעשות עצמן אלהות לפיכך נקנסה בו מיתה: "Adam was fit not to taste the taste of death. Why then was the penalty of death inflicted on him? Because the Holy One foresaw that Nebuchadnezzar and Hiram would in future claim to be divinities, therefore he was penalized with death." These pas-

sages are not cited against Mr. Tennant, but in confirmation of his general view. He brings out the fact that Rabbinic Judaism had a very deep sense of sin, but at the same time indicates that the existence of this sense of sin is quite distinct from theories as to its origin. "The doctrine of the *yezer hara*," says Mr. Tennant, very justly, is "*not* a doctrine of Original Sin" (pp. 167 seq.).

Mr. Tennant ably discusses the evidence from Ecclesiasticus (viii. 5; xv. 11, 14; xvii. 1 seq.; xxi. 11, 27; xxv. 24; xxxvii. 3; xl. 11; xlv. 2, 18). He holds that Ben Sira "believed an evil disposition to have been inherent in man from the first, and regarded this inclination, which the individual can still coerce by free-will and devotion to the law, as the source of his sinfulness. But so far from any signs of Ben Sira considering this evil nature to have been derived from our first parents' sin, more than one passage which has been mentioned above distinctly implies that he held it to have been originally implanted in man by God. . . . The result here reached is that the author of Ecclesiasticus taught that death was a consequence of the sin of the first parents of the race; and that, whilst seeing in this transgression the first of a series of human sins, he suspected no causal connexion between the first and the succeeding members of that series. In the literally rendered words of xxv. 24, the Fall was the *cause* of death, but only the *beginning* of sin" (pp. 116, 121). This excellent passage is an admirable example of Mr. Tennant's method. The author treats fully of the Alexandrian and pseud-epigraphic literature. The importance which he attaches to the latter as expressive of Jewish theology cannot be entirely accepted. But the matter is too difficult to discuss briefly. How difficult the matter is may be seen, e.g. from the Apocalypse of Baruch. Dr. Grenfell has lately given the best possible reason for believing that the Greek is after all the original of this book (*Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, part III, no. 403). That such a book should have been written in the first Christian century in Greek, and not in Hebrew or Aramaic, adds to the probability that it stands rather off the main line of Jewish development. And if this be true of one of the most Jewish in spirit of the pseud-epigrapha, one is at a loss how to place iv Ezra, which has so much that is foreign to, or at all events unparalleled in the authentic expressions of Jewish theology. But such discussions are here inappropriate; equally unseemly is it to comment too seriously on some misprints, e.g. on p. 167. The book is too good for such fault-finding. The volume is indeed so rich in secure facts, and so luminous with highly probable theories, that it is bound to become the classical work on its subject.

I. ABRAHAMS.